



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,909	04/19/2005	Mauro Barbuio	A-9534	3841

7590 08/10/2009
Hoffman Wasson & Gitler
2461 South Clark Street
Suite 522 Crystal Center II
Arlington, VA 22202

EXAMINER

MACARTHUR, VICTOR L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3679

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/10/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/531,909	Applicant(s) BARBUIO, MAURO	
	Examiner VICTOR MACARTHUR	Art Unit 3679	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) VICTOR MACARTHUR. (3) ____.

(2) Martin Hoffman. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 06 July 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: newly proposed claim 18 of after-final amendment of 7/29/2009.

Identification of prior art discussed: Koski USPN 5687525.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Victor MacArthur/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3679	
---	--

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant asked for assistance in moving case to allowance. The examiner pointed out that while the proposed new scope of claim 18 would require further search and/or consideration and would likely necessitate further rejection under new grounds such that it could not be entered without a filing of RCE.

The examiner further stated that Koski was substantially similar to applicant's claimed invention even as newly proposed.

The applicant's representative stated that Koski required twisting for removal of elements whereas applicant's invention could be removed without twisting. The examiner stated that no such functional limitation is currently in the claims and further warned that a recitation that prior art can function in a certain manner (i.e., removal by twisting) does not constitute proof that it cannot function in another manner (i.e., without twisting). The examiner suggested applicant refer to MPEP 2112.01(I) and MPEP 2114 which detail that when claimed structure is anticipated or made obvious in the prior art, any functional limitations must be presumed inherent to that prior art structure until applicant obtains and tests the prior art to prove otherwise. Accordingly, the examiner stated that it would be unlikely for the applicant to be able to obtain patentability for the current invention by introducing a new functional limitation in an after-final rejection (since the examiner would have to presume such a function to be inherent to the prior art structure). Rather the examiner suggested amending the claims to include enough critical structure to overcome the prior art rejections and other art of record via RCE.

The examiner also warned that the currently proposed version of claims appears to seek patentability based upon "substantially" recited dimensions. The examiner suggested applicant refer to MPEP 2144 which details that such limitations must have criticality (some unpredictable result) to avoid an obviousness rejection based upon case law alone (or by a secondary teaching reference if necessary).

The applicant's representative noted the length of prosecution and limited resources of applicant. The examiner stated that it is not feasible to enter after-final amendments that require further search and/or consideration after Final Rejection without filing of RCE, especially when such an amendment would likely require further rejection under new grounds (e.g., such as applicant's currently proposed version of 7/29/2009). However, the examiner stated that if applicant were to file a clean (free of 112 clarity issues) claim with sufficient structure to likely overcome any further art rejection, then such an amendment would be considered after final in the interest of compact prosecution. The examiner suggested a claim that recited the entire assembly structure and clip engagement shown in figure 2 including the details of the clip of figure 4 necessary to effect such engagement. Such amendment should be accompanied by remarks detailing claimed structure lacking in Koski and other art of record. The examiner reiterated that limitations regarding non-critical dimensions, shapes, materials would not likely overcome further rejection in and of themselves. The examiner repeated that functional limitations, while helpful in tying claimed structure together to set forth operability, rarely results in allowability in and of itself. A product claim is defined by its structure and a functional limitation limits a product claim only in as much as it necessitates a specific structural limitation. The examiner strongly urged not only amending the claims to include structure lacking in the art, but also ensuring that such structure have some criticality (unpredictable result) to avoid further obviousness rejection and noted the recent Supreme Court decision in KSR:

"[T]he results of ordinary innovation are not the subject of exclusive rights under the patent laws. Were it otherwise patents might stifle, rather than promote, the progress of useful arts. See U.S. Const., Art. I, section 8, cl.8." In re KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007).